DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 377 181 SP 035 621

AUTHOR Keller, Daniel L.; Grossman, John A.
TITLE A Model for Improving the Preservice Teacher/Cooperating Teacher Diad.
PUB DATE 13 Oct 94
NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-Western Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, October 13, 1994).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Cooperating Teachers; Elementary Secondary Education; Field Experience Programs; Higher Education; Literature Reviews; *Models; *Practicum Supervision; Preservice Teacher Education; Program Improvement; Student Teacher Supervisors; *Student Teaching; Supervisor Qualifications; *Supervisory Training; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Responsibility; *Teacher Supervision
IDENTIFIERS Model Development; *Preservice Teachers

ABSTRACT

Field experiences for preservice teachers are replete with problems including insufficient budgets and concerns about the dominance of the preservice teacher, cooperating teacher, and university supervisor triad. This paper advocates the development of a diadic model that would, through training, expand the supervisory role of the cooperating teacher and eliminate the role of the university supervisor. A literature review supported 13 elements for inclusion in a proposed diadic model. The elements were grouped into four thematic clusters: ability to develop teaching skills; communication; improvement of preservice teaching; and cognitive domain. A survey instrument rated teachers' perception of degree of importance and degree of teacher competence regarding each element. According to the data analysis, teachers rated importance slightly higher than competence and tended to rate their competence high in elements they thought to be important. The element receiving the least support for importance and competence was knowledge of adult learning theory. Providing meaningful feedback was rated highest in importance and knowledge of planning skills was rated highest in teacher competence. The proposed diadic partnership model, a field study instrument, and sources for content analysis are appended. (Contains 24 references.) (LL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 377 181

A MODEL FOR IMPROVING THE PRESERVICE TEACHER/COOPERATING TEACHER DIAD

DANIEL L. KELLER, Ph.D.

JOHN A. GROSSMAN, M.A

Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-Western Educational Research Association

Chicago, Illinois

October 13, 1994

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. L. Keller

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SP035621

2

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

Assaults on teacher education are numerous and have brought about calls for reform. Even though preservice students value field experience and teacher educators view it as important, field experiences are replete with problems including insufficient budget, concerns about university supervisors, and identified cooperating teacher weaknesses. Although problems are obvious and reform has been called for, many institutions have not changed their field experience model and the triad continues its dominance. Change may be pragmatic and not visionary and the diad may become the dominant field preparation model. The profession must anticipate this possibility and identify supervisory elements appropriate for inclusion within a diadic model.

Through a literature review this study identified 8 supervision models. A content analysis of these models yielded 36 independent supervisory elements. Frequency counts and strong support from the knowledge base supported thirteen elements for inclusion within a proposed diadic model. These supervision elements were grouped into four thematic clusters: ability to develop teaching skills; communication; improvement of preservice teaching; and cognitive domain.

A survey instrument was constructed to rate the teacher perception of: (1) degree of importance; and (2) degree of teacher competence regarding each of the 13 identified elements. All elements obtained importance ratings of great or moderate. Teachers rated importance slightly higher than competence and tended to rate their competence high in elements they thought to be important. The element receiving the least support for importance and competence was knowledge of adult learning theory. Providing meaningful feedback was rated highest in importance and knowledge of planning skills was rated highest in teacher competence

INTRODUCTION

Are teachers made or are they shaped? Should teachers be trained or should they gain competence through reflective thought and inquiry? These are heatedly argued questions that, after decades, continue to affect the direction of teacher education. One issue, whether or not the framework of teacher preparation programs should contain practicum work, is moot, since governmental and accreditation agencies require field or similar experiences to fulfill degree or certification requirements. Zeichner (1980) designated field experiences as useful and significant within the context of professional preparation. Cruickshank (1985) and Koehler (1988) concluded the knowledge base supports the assumption that practice teaching is the preparation element most important in transforming preservice students into beginning professionals.

There is little to indicate that field experience or practicum experience is not highly valued or useful in the context of teacher preparation. One notable exception is the recent research of Kim Metcalf (1992) of Indiana University. His findings suggest that students undergoing research-based laboratory preparation with decreased amounts of field work compare favorably to similar groups that underwent traditional preparation.

Assuming the modal curriculum continues to stipulate the inclusion of field experience, a key issue becomes how to best organize and supervise the field experiences of preservice students. Among teacher education models, the traditional triad of preservice teacher, cooperating teacher, and university representative/ supervisor remains widespread (Anderson, 1992). Still, scholars have noted: (1) weaknesses of the triadic model; and (2) associated conditions capable of initiating change, whether wanted or not.

(1)

THE PROBLEM

Widespread assaults on teacher preparation remain numerous and are not without significance (Warger & Aldinger, 1984). Themes of reform, in part, led to **envisioned** (but still not totally enacted) Holmes Group proposals, including expanding the role and status of the cooperating teacher. Confounding factors may modify or stalemate changes sought by reformers. Changes necessitated by reality may override changes envisioned by reform advocates.

Several such conditions have already been identified. Moore et al. (1986), alerted the profession when stating that schools of education "have starved the student teaching program at the expense of the more profitable graduate programs and/or even more spectacular undergraduate programs (p.3)." Anderson (1992) noted several associated concerns contained in responses gleamed from her analysis of student teaching models. Primary was the large number of faculty who commented on the possibility of budgetary conditions overriding reform. Also, university supervisors foresaw an increase in videotaping practice teaching, the use of competency-based teacher education, and more first job training for novice teachers (assuming the decline of practicum opportunities). In short, many charged with the responsibility of providing quality practicum experiences envisioned higher education policy makers downsizing or abandoning the traditional but expensive element of field placement. This does not speak favorably for considering teaching as a true profession.

If budgetary conditions fuel program design, more so than knowledge of what should be, a number of conditions become predictable. First, universities may well turn over supervisory duties to graduate assistants or professors with little interest in supervision, that is, make supervision a time-consuming, unwanted, unrewarding venture with limited intrinsic or extrinsic value; a punishment! This scenario is already

a reality, especially at large research universities seeking to increase grant production and scholarly writing. Indeed, the actual administration of field and practicum work may shortly be relinquished to graduate assistants. Second, universities will change the parameters and availability of graduate associate jobs, reducing the pool of university supervisors. Third, to provide supervision universities will draw from a pool of "cheaper" part-time employees, who in effect will be independent agents subleased by the university. Last, to save even more money, universities will slowly turn over control of teacher preparation to cooperating teachers and school districts who seek the rewards inherent in such partnerships. Decision makers may, as one of Anderson's respondents stated, regret abandoning the direction and responsibility of supervising preservice teachers, forfeiting partial control of teacher preparation.

Program budget, while notable, is only one of many conditions likely to precipitate **pragmatic revision** rather than purposeful change. Of note are conditions allied with university supervision. Kull et al. (1991) identified deficiencies capable of diminishing supervisor effectiveness. First, most programs cannot assure supervisor continuity to participating schools beyond one year. This results in expensive and repetitive supervisor training. Second, the high annual turnover level assures a large population of debuting supervisors, who initially lack experience but over time gain competence, just before relinquishing the position to new novices. Third, scholarly pursuits and heavy work loads limit the time supervisors, whether faculty or associates, spend with practicum students. Insufficient time impedes the ability of supervisors to assimilate school program and context, limiting effectiveness.

Westerman and Smith (1993) stated that Goodlad's 1991 study concluded that university supervision of preservice students is more often driven by internal bureaucratic and regulatory factors than by research models derived from the underlying knowledge base of teacher education. There has been a propensity among preparation units not to seek new models and redefine the role of the university

supervisor. Anderson's (1992) survey results indicate that 87% of all reporting teacher preparation units continue to use the traditional triadic supervision model. Even though the Holmes Group calls for reform in the professional preparation of teachers, over 62% of respondents indicate no change in the currently used supervisory model. The above study concluded that: (1) reform movements have little or no effect on the role of the university supervisor; and (2) research has not yet clearly established what is the one best approach to the supervision of preservice teachers.

Koehler (1988), in agreement with previously noted scholars, indicated the role of the university supervisor remains poorly defined and ambiguous at best. Her earlier studies cast doubt on the long-standing assumption that supervisors significantly affect the classroom practice of practicum students.

Koehler's (1988) research identified another problematic supervision condition, namely, the relationship between university supervisor and cooperating teacher. Study results indicated clinical practice processes make the cooperating teacher-university supervisor relationship awkward, since feedback sessions might be interpreted as criticism of student behaviors modeled or suggested by cooperating teachers.

In summary, the problem of supervision is complex and holds implications for the future of teacher education, directly, and the quality of future teaching, indirectly. While the concept of educational partnerships has broadened with the emergence of reform movements nested in Holmes Group philosophy, little change has occurred in the dominant model, that is, the preservice teacher-cooperating teacher-university supervisor triad. In fact , evidence indicates the role of cooperating teacher lacks clarity and continues to decrease, making field experience more diadic.

While reform calls for envisioned changes, budget realities and supervisor availability may dictate revisions unrelated to the knowledge base. Universities have

traditionally been charged with the responsibility of delivering student practicum experiences. This responsibility will likely remain, but if lost may never be regained. Universities have historically provided knowledgeable supervisory personnel for developing preservice student competence. Conditions indicate this can no longer be guaranteed.

Reform literature speaks frequently of empowering teachers and expanding the role of the cooperating teacher. This will enhance the probability of diadic relationships increasing in number. While saving money on supervision and expanding the cooperating teacher's role, accreditation groups and governmental agencies likely will continue to hold universities responsible for administering practicum programs, since degrees are issued and standards are implied if not assumed. Standards for field experience have less clarity and rigor in comparison to student teaching expectations. Resources are less plentiful for field experience, leading one to conclude the diadic model may first experience widespread use in field work that precedes student teaching. It can be assumed that universities forced to make additional cuts will: (1) eliminate supervisors; and (2) increase the use of the diad and clinical preparation of cooperating teachers. Teacher education must prepare for such possibilities and research a new diadic model of field supervision.

Research Questions

Based on the previous discussion of the nature of the problem, the research questions for this study become:

1. What models of supervision can be identified from the knowledge base?
2. What elements of supervision from these models are frequently noted within the knowledge base?
3. To what degree do practitioners in identified supervision elements: (1) consider independent elements as important; and (2) perceive themselves as competent cooperating teachers in each independent element?

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The role of the cooperating teacher in the development of preservice teachers has been studied at great length over several decades. One assumption emerging from this line of inquiry is that the cooperating teacher tends to be the most significant influence during student teaching (Karmos & Jacko, 1977; Manning, 1977). However, even though influential this diadic relationship is not without weaknesses. Research by Zimpher, deVoss, and Nott (1980) indicated that cooperating teachers: (1) frequently do not critically evaluate preservice teachers; (2) are not willing to consistently observe preservice teachers during instruction; and (3) tend to avoid critical remarks, even though weaknesses were identified. In short, cooperating teachers, through their own habits, fail to provide accurate feedback impeding professional growth and opportunities for reflection.

Research indicates that preservice teachers lack empowerment in that they frequently are forced to engage in narrow, tightly controlled (by cooperating teachers) activities (Tabachnick, Popkewitz, & Zeichner; 1979). Findings revealed that: (1) preservice teacher instruction becomes mechanical and centers on moving students through predetermined time boundaries; (2) interaction between children and preservice teachers is limited in duration and is impersonal; and (3) few opportunities are provided for clinical evaluation and reflection.

Literature suggests that cooperating teachers should be trained in basic supervisory skills. Terrell and Grimes (1986) identified specific competencies nested within a larger clinical supervisory model and grouped them by function into the following categories: (1) communication; (2) management; (3) conferencing; (4) observation skills; (5) data collection and analysis; and (6) evaluation.

Alessia and Owens (1983) also detailed competencies for cooperating

teachers: (1) establish a positive atmosphere; (2) accurately present the expectations of the school; (3) assist in developing planning skills; (4) delegating responsibility over appropriate timeframes; (5) encourage individuality and personal growth; (6) develop classroom management skills; and (7) assist in promoting self-evaluation.

Literature on purely diadic supervision is limited, still, there is an adequate knowledge base of supervision models containing individual elements, useful to synthesize a new model. Anderson (1992) synthesized previous models and classified them into five related categories: (1) Traditional Model- in which the university supervisor's role is to observe practicum students, consult with the cooperating teacher and formally assess the student's effectiveness in relation to program objectives; (2) Modified Traditional Model- in which the university supervisor's role is to cluster student teachers at one site to enhance coordination efforts; (3) Clinical Professor Model- in which the university supervisor and classroom teacher/educator are one working with both teachers and students while providing inservice activities on site; (4) The Teacher Adjunct Model- in which the university supervisor maintains contact with the cooperating teacher but does not directly supervise the progress of the student; the role is more of a liaison and coordinating service and; (5) Master Teacher/Apprentice Model- in which the role of the university supervisor does not exist but the supervisor duties includes recording the final grade. Elements that can be deduced from the above synthesized models include:

Model	Elements
Traditional	Observation, Assessment, Coordination, Estab. Objectives
Modified Traditional	Above with emphasis on Coordination
Clinical Professor	Observation, Assessment, Providing Inservice Growth
Teacher Adjunct	Coordinating
Master Teacher	Some Coordinating, Recording Grade

Glickman (1985) made substantial contributions to the developmental supervision model. Included within this model are the elements of instructional strategies, goal identification, supervisory strategies, adult development theory, and interpersonal skills.

Kull et al. (1991) proposed no model but cited as important the development of a best model for collaborative supervision. They proposed numerous elements for inclusion within supervisory models including decision making, providing a safe forum, collaborative action research, and seminar-type discussions based on real life issues.

Westerman and Smith (1993) postulated that teaching is a series of complex problems within the classroom context, implying that problem solving and decision making are paramount elements for inclusion within any supervisory model. This conclusion/assumption is based on data from studies comparing the thinking skills and decision making processes of expert and novice teachers Master teachers demonstrated schemata that enhanced perception and interpretation of meaningful classroom events. In contrast, novices lacked skills metacognition skills, leading to conditions underlying failure to identify problems and effect correct decisions. Their model, derived from study findings, emphasized observation, videotaping, interviewing (feedback), teacher decision making and evaluation as meaningful elements.

Moore et al. (1986) summarized Cooper's (University of Virginia) efforts on behalf of practicum teaching. Cooper argued before the Virginia General Assembly that practicum work was "resource starved." He cited numerous student teacher weaknesses including student teachers modeling cooperating teacher performance, assigning student teachers to supervisors at random, lack of recognition and rewards for cooperating teachers, and the failure to incorporate outstanding practitioners within teacher preparation programs. He proposed to train cooperating teachers as clinical

supervisors, renumerate them, and give clinical supervisors faculty status. Elements suggested within the framework of clinical training included supervisory techniques, providing daily feedback, and performing regular summative and formative evaluation.

Oja and Ham (1988) suggested teachers and principals should assume the responsibility for supervising practicum experience. University staff would serve as consultants sharing the knowledge base of supervisory models. Participating professionals would regularly meet to identify common goals and design action research enterprises in supervision, educational theory, and staff development. The above scholars suggested as model elements observation, interviewing, knowledge of adult development, and obtaining knowledge about current supervisory models.

Zimpher and Howey (1987) in a synthesis of supervisory practices identified three general models of supervision (clinical, developmental, and counseling), from which were identified four genres of teacher competence: technical, clinical, personal, and critical. These competencies contain within processes or elements of supervision including identification of problems, observation, feedback, coaching, and recycling.

Each competency assumes a different conception of the supervisor. Technical competence emphasizes skill development, the mastery of instructional methods, mastery of specific technical skills such as questioning, insuring that preservice students can select and organize curriculum, maintaining classroom order, and effective use of resources. Supervisors targeting clinical competence foster inquiry and reflection, especially the investigation of relationships between theory and practice and the enhancement of problem solving. Personal competence supervisors value and place into practice the elements of enhancing self-awareness, fostering identity formation, clarifying values, and promoting interpersonal behaviors leading to preservice students developing warm and supportive learning environments. Critical competence conceives the teacher to be rationally and morally autonomous, a socially conscious agent of change. As a result this model emphasizes

reflective and collaborative supervisory practices that critically examine personal practices.

Weller's (1983) study of supervisory models disclosed that little attention has been given to determining the professional competencies of cooperating teachers necessary for effective supervision of practicum students. Six general areas for effective supervision of preservice teachers were specified: (1) coordinator of a team approach; (2) long and short range planning; (3) interpersonal and conference skills; (4) evaluation techniques; (5) instructional skill in classroom management; and (6) professional role modeling.

Marland (1986) concluded that conceptualization of teaching skills may be more useful in post teaching situations instead of beforehand. Training preservice teachers in generic teaching skills is logical and scientific but somewhat naive and idealistic since discrete skills by themselves do not match the complexity of the classroom. Skill models are complex for novices (and even veteran teachers) and may contain large lists of skills containing numerous sub skills. The danger of skills being presented beforehand lies in the continued practice of presenting skills as unconnected and unrelated, leading to poor conceptualization of the role of skills within the complex, holistic environment of the classroom. Supervisors seeking to incorporate skills within preservice field experiences would do well to group or sequence them (Marland, 1986; Keller, 1993).

Marland (1986) favored interactive models that discriminated between immediate and long term events, monitored and controlled events, focused on the interpretation of events, and allowed for the overlapping of two or more classroom events simultaneously. Findings supported the inclusion of information processing and decision making as supervisory elements.

The research of Keller (1993) supported to some degree Marland's assumptions about skills in teacher preparation. Results indicated that skills can be

identified as critical by a screening mechanism supported by expert consensus, and that clustering teaching skills provides meaning and perhaps facilitate skill training.

Two additional sources proposed elements of preservice teacher supervision. Warger and Aldinger (1984) delineated feedback, observation, intervention, and instructional competencies. Cohn and Gellman (1988) specified a heavy emphasis on fostering inquiry practices leading to the development of reflective teachers as espoused by Dewey.

METHODOLOGY

Descriptors were denoted in the ERIC catalog and a search was conducted using the items "models," "preservice teachers," and "supervision." From this combination 36 sources were identified and a literature review was conducted. A content analysis was undertaken for the purposes of: (1) identifying supervision models; and (2) determining the frequency mention of supervision elements contained within models. The nature of the research is exploratory and the results of the content analysis are reported as descriptive statistics.

The results of the content analysis and prevalent literature themes supported 13 supervisory elements (identified in results) for inclusion in a new diadic model. A four-point Likert-like survey instrument (see Appendix A) was then constructed, ranging from a rating of 4 (Great Degree) to a rating of 1 (Not At All). The survey gathered data regarding practitioner perception of two constructs: (1) to what degree do practitioners view as important individual elements contained within the proposed diadic model; and (2) to what degree do practitioners, regarding each individual element, perceive their own competence in supervising field students? After revision the survey was given in a field test to 25 practicing teachers of various subjects, grades, and levels of cooperating teacher experience. A cover letter, containing

instructions, was attached to the survey and the completion time did not exceed 10 minutes. A selected group of the field study population was used to ascertain whether the instrument had face and content validity, that is, was it attempting to measure supervisory elements. Feedback indicated practitioners agreed the survey contained supervisory elements with study value.

RESULTS

The 36 sources yielded 15 instances in which supervisory elements were nested within models or suggested for future inclusion. Eight models were identified from 13 instances:

MODEL	FREQUENCY
INTERACTIVE	2
COUNSELING	1
CLINICAL	4
DEVELOPMENTAL	2
TRADITIONAL	1
MODIFIED TRADITIONAL	1
TEACHER ADJUNCT	1
MASTER TEACHER	1

In addition total of 36 supervisory elements were identified as noted in Table 1 below.

TABLE 1

SUPERVISION ELEMENTS IDENTIFIED FROM LITERATURE REVIEW

Element	Frequency	Source
Clinical supervision training	1	A
Knowledge of instructional strategies	4	A, B, C, D
Feedback	5	A, D, E, F, G
Goal identification	2	C, F
Knowledge of supervisory strategies	3	A, C, F
Knowledge of adult development	2	C, F
Analysis of teaching	1	H
Teaching skills	2	B, I
Inter/intra personal skills	3	B, C, J
Decision making	4	B, I, K, L
Transition skills	1	B
Communication	1	M
Knowledge of management skills	3	J, M, N
Conferencing skills	1	M
Observation	6	D, F, G,
Data collection/action research	2	K, M
Evaluation	6	A, J, L, M, N, O
Positive attitude	1	N
Presenting school expectations	1	N
Planning skills	3	B, J, N
Delegating responsibility to student teacher	1	N
Fostering personal growth	1	N

TABLE 1 (continued)

SUPERVISION ELEMENTS IDENTIFIED FROM LITERATURE REVIEW

Element	Frequency	Source
Reflection/ reflective thinking	3	B, N, P
Coordination of students time and role	2	J, O
Objectives	1	O
Inservice growth	1	O
Safe forum	1	K
Seminar issues	1	K
Problem solving	1	L
Videotaping	1	L
Problem Identification	1	G
Coaching	1	G
Recycling	1	G
Professional role modeling	1	J
Intervention	1	D
Information processing	1	I

See APPENDIX B for a complete coding of sources.

A review of frequencies indicated that several elements received ample support including:

1. Knowledge of instructional skills
2. Knowledge of management skills
3. Knowledge of planning skills

4. Problem solving/decision making
5. Reflective thinking/reflection/self-evaluation
6. Inter/intrapersonal skills
7. Expertise in conferencing with students/issue presentation
8. Feedback
9. Observation of preservice students
10. Evaluation of preservice students
11. Goal identification
12. Knowledge of adult development
13. Knowledge of supervisory strategies.

The above elements were grouped into four thematic clusters, as suggested by literature, and are presented below:

CLUSTER 1- ABILITY TO DEVELOP TEACHING SKILLS

Instructional skills

Management skills

Planning skills

CLUSTER 2- COMMUNICATION

Inter/intra personal skills

Conferencing/issue presentation

Feedback

CLUSTER 3- IMPROVEMENT OF PRESERVICE STUDENT'S TEACHING

Observation

Evaluation

Goal identification

Knowledge of adult learning theory

Knowledge of supervisory strategies

(15)

CLUSTER 4- COGNITIVE DOMAIN

Problem solving/decision making

Reflective thinking/self-evaluation

The results of the previously mentioned field study are contained in Table 2 below.

TABLE 2

RESULTS OF FIELD STUDY REGARDING PRACTICING TEACHERS AND IDENTIFIED ELEMENTS OF SUPERVISION (MEAN)

Element	Importance	Competence
KNOWLEDGE OF INSTRUCTIONAL SKILLS	3.48	3.44
KNOWLEDGE OF MANAGEMENT SKILLS	3.72	3.36
KNOWLEDGE OF PLANNING SKILLS	3.68	3.56
PROBLEM SOLVING AND DECISION MAKING	3.56	3.12
EXPERTISE IN REFLECTIVE THINKING	3.24	3.12
EXPERTISE IN INTERPERSONAL SKILLS	3.76	3.32
EXPERTISE IN CONFERENCING WITH STUDENTS	3.68	3.12
EXPERTISE IN STUDENT OBSERVATION	3.36	3.40
EXPERTISE IN STUDENT EVALUATION	3.60	3.20
EXPERTISE IN GOAL IDENTIFICATION	3.56	3.12
KNOWLEDGE OF ADULT LEARNING THEORY	3.00	2.40
KNOWLEDGE OF SUPERVISORY STRATEGY	3.36	3.12
PROVIDING MEANINGFUL FEEDBACK	3.84	3.36

Thirteen supervisory elements were rated by field study participants. The range of means regarding importance of supervisory skills was .84 (3.84 - 3.00). All means were above 3.00 (moderate importance) and eight means were 3.5 or higher, indicating agreement to a great degree. This supported: (1) the results of the literature search concerning importance of supervision elements; and (2) the face and content validity of supervisory elements identified as important. Eight elements displayed a mean of 3.5 or greater (highest to lowest):

1- Providing meaningful feedback

2- Expertise in inter/intra personal skills

3- Knowledge of management skills

4- Expertise in conferencing with students

5- Knowledge of planning skills

6- Expertise in student evaluation

7- Expertise in problem solving/decision making strategies

8- Expertise in goal identification

Most remaining elements had means close to 3.5. The notable exception was knowledge of adult learning theory which had a mean of 3.0. Going somewhat against the literature base findings was the ranking of expertise in reflective thinking as 12th among the thirteen elements, with a mean of 3.24.

The means of the second study construct, competence in supervisory elements, were lower, when compared to importance, in all but one instance (Expertise in student observation). The range of the means was 1.16. The highest competency mean was 3.56 (Planning skills), followed by instructional skills, student observation, management skills, and providing feedback to students. The lowest mean was again knowledge of adult learning theory (2.40), followed by supervisory strategies and goal identification.

DISCUSSION

The review of literature indicated several dominant themes. First, the current practice of supervising field students is flawed, regardless of format. Limitations of supervisors are numerous and include poorly defined roles, tentative relationship with cooperating teachers, lack of training, scholarly commitments, lack of longevity, and insufficient time spent with preservice teachers. These conditions when mixed with university budgetary and bureaucratic shortcomings, along with findings that university supervisors have little or no affect on behaviors of field students, bode poorly for the future of the traditional triadic supervision model.

Second, findings indicate that cooperating teachers greatly influence preservice teachers. This is also problematical since the knowledge base warns of negatives associated with blindly modeling behaviors learned from mentors. It cannot be assumed that master practitioners are also cooperating teachers. Research also indicates that cooperating teachers have shortcomings in critical evaluation, hiding identified weaknesses, and giving accurate and appropriate feedback.

Third, present conditions and reform positions call for change in how students are supervised. Even so, institutions are not instigating change unless forced too by unrelated issues, mostly budgetary. There are numerous possibilities for change but the predictable one is turning the triad into a diad. Another is to prepare students outside of classrooms, likely in clinical settings.

Fourth, universities could reduce shortcomings of cooperating teachers by: (1) training cooperating teachers in basic supervisory skills; (2) identifying critical competencies of effective cooperating teachers; (3) develop research based models; and (4) determine what is a "best" model. The literature implies that the clinical

supervision model is appropriate for student preparation and the development of more knowledgeable and competent cooperating teachers.

Reducing the shortcomings of cooperating teachers is problematical. Cost outlays would be immediate and perhaps painful. As with direct field supervision, many faculty may not wish to participate, spending time on other undertakings. Eventually, universities would save supervision money, eliminate costly annual training (retraining), better utilize graduate student time and provide the future professorate pool more opportunities for collaborative research and scholarship. The reality is there must be change, otherwise the quality of teacher preparation will remain the same or decline. Preparing the cooperating teacher for supervision may ultimately be the most attractive long-term option.

Fifth, the literature base offers numerous supervisory models and associated supervisory elements, easily adaptable for inclusion within a diadic partnership. The development of any model should not be impeded by agenda or philosophical conflicts such as those between proponents of skill training and reflective practice. The knowledge base continually shows support for elements considered by many to be conflicting, but may in actuality conflict only with personal agenda.

Discussion will conclude with three sections: (1) support for including elements within a diadic model; (2) insights generated from the field study; and (3) questions for further study and recommendations. The diadic partnership model proposed by the authors contains 13 supervisory skills/abilities nested within four clusters presented below.

DIADIC PARTNERSHIP MODEL FOR PRACTICUM EXPERIENCES

BY DANIEL L. KELLER AND JOHN A. GROSSMAN

ABILITY TO DEVELOP TEACHING SKILLS

INSTRUCTIONAL SKILLS

MANAGEMENT SKILLS

PLANNING SKILLS

COMMUNICATION SKILLS

INTERPERSONAL SKILLS

CONFERENCING/ISSUE PRESENTATION

FEEDBACK

IMPROVEMENT OF PRESERVICE TEACHING

OBSERVATION

EVALUATION

GOAL IDENTIFICATION

KNOWLEDGE OF ADULT LEARNING THEORY

KNOWLEDGE OF SUPERVISORY STRATEGIES

COGNITIVE DOMAIN

PROBLEM SOLVING/DECISION MAKING

REFLECTIVE THINKING/SELF-EVALUATION

A primary goal of supervision is the improvement of teaching. Therefore, elements under this cluster are easy to defend. Evaluation and observation have been identified as key weaknesses in cooperating teacher performance. The results of the content analysis indicated these two skills to have the highest frequency of mention. Recent literature is replete with the strides in adult development theory and associated implications for teacher educators as to how novices learn. Also receiving a high frequency mention was knowledge of supervisory strategies. This supervisory element is currently within the domain of the university supervisor. Dropping the triad in favor of the diad would logically necessitate shifting this responsibility to the cooperating teacher, therefore, mandating inclusion within a training model.

Recent literature portrays the teacher as decision maker within a complex teaching environment. Supervisory models make frequent mention of decision making, self-evaluation, and reflective thinking. Few in the profession would argue these elements have no value, although some may argue against models based solely on decision making and reflective thinking.

To make good decisions one must first be informed. Without question, many, if not most, preservice teachers lack the experience and underlying knowledge to effect informed decisions. In this light the authors propose, as a model cluster, communication skills. Conferencing can serve as a vehicle for informing novices, and has for decades in the form of seminars. To provide substance, enhance reflective thinking, and promote decision making, the authors propose adding issue presentation to conferencing. Feedback stands on its own merits as part of a diadic model, having received notable support from the content analysis results. But it becomes even more essential upon the realization that all four clusters are dependent on good feedback for success.

The shortcomings of instructional skill development and training were detailed

within the literature review, as were proposed corrections. Clearly, supervisors must possess knowledge of instructional skills, since failures and repetitions in student teaching experiences are frequently linked to poor instruction, management , or planning. These elements were frequently mentioned within the content analysis and are supported by past effective teaching research.

The field study does not merit conclusions because of the preliminary stage of research and the exploratory nature of this project. Still, even with a small field study population and the inability to generalize, some interesting observations arose. Practitioners concurred that the 13 elements of supervision included within the diadic model are important to good supervision. One element, knowledge of adult learning theory, had visibly less support than the other elements (3.0 = moderate support). This is in contrast to the knowledge base and may be a result of practitioners lacking exposure to adult (versus childhood) learning theory.

Teachers ranked their competence in supervisory elements lower than element importance. This was hypothesized by the researchers and came as no surprise. However, the difference between the summated means of perceived importance and perceived self-competence was unanticipated, being only .326 (3.526 -3.200). Do teachers actually possess such levels of competence or are they naive in what embodies good supervision; would teacher educators and building principals similarly rate teacher competence?

A comparison of cluster means indicated teachers valued as most important the clusters of (1) communications skills and (2) ability to develop teaching skills. Valued less were skills such as reflective thinking contained within the cognitive domain cluster, leading one to wonder if practitioners share the zeal of proponents of reflective thinking. It is interesting to note two observations: (1) elements contained within the communication skills and ability to develop teaching skills clusters reflected the traditional model of supervision; and (2) practitioners rated competence highest in the

elements they perceived as most important.

As a result of this preliminary study the authors offer the aforementioned Diadic Partnership Model for future study and/or use. In addition the following recommendations are tendered:

1- Develop strategies to more accurately identify master teachers with high levels of preexisting knowledge and skills.

2- Provide opportunities for teacher training/growth in elements contained within the Diadic Partnership Model.

3- Emphasize clinical supervision methods when training cooperating teachers.

4- Survey other groups, e.g., teacher educators and principals to ascertain the degree of consensus as to importance of supervisory elements and teacher competence in supervisory elements.

5- Enhance further study by providing future respondents detailed definitions and examples of the 13 model elements.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A - FIELD STUDY INSTRUMENT

APPENDIX B - SOURCES FOR CONTENT ANALYSIS

SURVEY

DIADIC ELEMENTS OF SUPERVISION

DIRECTIONS: BELOW IS A **TWO PART SURVEY**. ON THE LEFT AND RIGHT SIDE IS AN IDENTICAL LIST OF SUPERVISORY SKILLS THAT POTENTIALLY COULD BE INCLUDED WITHIN A MODEL FOR THE SUPERVISION OF FIELD EXPERIENCE STUDENTS BY COOPERATING TEACHERS. USING THE RATING SCALE BELOW PLEASE RATE **ON THE LEFT** THE DEGREE TO WHICH YOU BELIEVE EACH ELEMENT WOULD BE IMPORTANT TO GOOD SUPERVISION. **ON THE RIGHT** RATE THE DEGREE TO WHICH YOU HAVE (AT THE CURRENT TIME) COMPETENCE AS A COOPERATING TEACHER IN EACH SUPERVISION ELEMENT.

SCALE: **4= TO A GREAT DEGREE** **3= TO A MODERATE DEGREE**
2= TO A MINIMAL DEGREE **1= NOT AT ALL**
CIRCLE YOUR CHOICE ON THE RIGHT AND LEFT SCALES

HOW IMPORTANT IS EACH OF THE FOLLOWING ELEMENTS IN THE SUPERVISION OF FIELD EXPERIENCE STUDENTS (ASSUMING YOU WERE A COOPERATING TEACHER)?

KNOWLEDGE OF INSTRUCTIONAL SKILLS
4 3 2 1
KNOWLEDGE OF MANAGEMENT SKILLS
4 3 2 1
KNOWLEDGE OF PLANNING SKILLS
4 3 2 1
EXPERTISE IN PROBLEM SOLVING AND DECISION MAKING STRATEGIES
4 3 2 1
EXPERTISE IN REFLECTIVE THINKING
4 3 2 1
EXPERTISE IN INTERPERSONAL SKILLS
4 3 2 1
EXPERTISE IN CONFERENCING WITH STUDENTS
4 3 2 1
EXPERTISE IN STUDENT OBSERVATION
4 3 2 1
EXPERTISE IN STUDENT EVALUATION
4 3 2 1
EXPERTISE IN GOAL IDENTIFICATION
4 3 2 1
KNOWLEDGE OF ADULT LEARNING THEORY
4 3 2 1
KNOWLEDGE OF SUPERVISORY STRATEGY
4 3 2 1
PROVIDING MEANINGFUL FEEDBACK
4 3 2 1

HOW COMPETENT DO YOU BELIEVE YOU WOULD BE AS A COOPERATING TEACHER IN EACH OF THE FOLLOWING SUPERVISORY ELEMENTS?

KNOWLEDGE OF INSTRUCTIONAL SKILLS
4 3 2 1
KNOWLEDGE OF MANAGEMENT SKILLS
4 3 2 1
KNOWLEDGE OF PLANNING SKILLS
4 3 2 1
EXPERTISE IN PROBLEM SOLVING AND DECISION MAKING STRATEGIES
4 3 2 1
EXPERTISE IN REFLECTIVE THINKING
4 3 2 1
EXPERTISE IN INTERPERSONAL SKILLS
4 3 2 1
EXPERTISE IN CONFERENCING WITH STUDENTS
4 3 2 1
EXPERTISE IN STUDENT OBSERVATION
4 3 2 1
EXPERTISE IN STUDENT EVALUATION
4 3 2 1
EXPERTISE IN GOAL IDENTIFICATION
4 3 2 1
KNOWLEDGE OF ADULT LEARNING THEORY
4 3 2 1
KNOWLEDGE OF SUPERVISORY STRATEGY
4 3 2 1
PROVIDING MEANINGFUL FEEDBACK
4 3 2 1

SOURCES FOR CONTENT ANALYSIS STUDY

CODE	AUTHOR(S)
A	MOORE ET AL. (COOPER)
B	KELLER
C	GLICKMAN
D	WARGER AND ALDINGER
E	WESTERMAN AND SMITH
F	OJA AND HAM
G	ZIMPHER AND HOWEY
H	GOLDHAMMER
I	MARLAND
J	WELLER
K	KULL ET AL.
L	WESTERMAN AND SMITH
M	TERRELL AND GRIMES
N	ALESSIA AND OWENS
O	ANDERSON
P	COHN AND GELLMAN

Bibliography Page

Alessia, M. and Owens, K. (1983). Handbook for the student teaching semester. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 235 122

Anderson, D. (1992). A quantitative analysis of student teacher supervision models: implications for the role of university supervisors. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 343 862.

Cohn, M. and Gellman, V. (1988). Supervision: a developmental approach for fostering inquiry in preservice teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 39(2), pp. 2-8.

Cruickshank, D. (1985). Models for the Preparation of America's Teachers. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa.

Glickman, C. (1985). Supervision of Instruction: A Developmental Approach. Boston: MA. 27 and Bacon,

Goldhammer, R. (1969). Clinical Supervision: Special Methods for the Supervision of Teachers. NY:NY, Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Karmos, A. and Jacko, C. (1977). The role of significant others during the student teaching experience. Journal of Teacher Education, 13(2), pp. 51-5.

Keller, D. (1993). The identification and validation of teaching skills critical to generic elementary classroom teaching as determined by expert consensus among educator subgroups. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH.

Koehler, V. (1988). Barriers to the effective supervision of student teachers: a field study, Journal of Teacher Education, 39 (2), p.32.

Kull, J., Oja, and Ellis. (1991). Models of collaborative supervision involving teacher educators and school personnel in new roles and activities via collaborative supervisory teams. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 352 350

Manning, D. (1977). The influence of key individuals on student teachers in urban and suburban settings, Teacher Educator, 13(2), pp. 2-8

Marland, P. (1986). Models of teachers' interactive thinking. Elementary School Journal, 87(2), pp. 209-26.

Metcalf, K. (1992). The effects of a guided training experience on the instructional clarity of preservice teachers. Teaching and Teacher Education. 8(3), pp.275-86.

Moore, J. et al. (1986). Clinical instructor: and expanded role for teachers in teacher education. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 271 435

Oja, S. (1988). A collaborative approach to leadership and supervision: program assessment report. Part B or final report. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 304 432

Oja, S. and Ham, M. (1988). A collaborative approach to leadership in supervision: practice profile. Part C of final report. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 304 433

Tabachnick, B, Popkewitz, and Zeichner, K. (1979). Teacher education and the professional prospectives of student teachers, Interchange on Educational Policy.

Terrell, M. and Grimes, M. (1986). Handbook for directing teachers. Developed as part of the teacher education internship project. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 272 473

Warger, C. and Aldinger, L. (1984). Improving student teacher supervision: the preservice consultation model, Teacher Education and Special Education, 7(3), pp. 155-63.

Weiler, D. (1983). Essential competencies for effective supervision of the student teacher, Education, 104(2), pp. 213-18.

Westerman, D. and Smith, S. (1993). A research-based model for the clinical supervision of student teachers. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 361 282

Zeichner, K. (1980). Myths and realities: field-based experiences in preservice teacher education, 31(6), pp.45-49, 51-55.

Zimpher, N, deVoss, G. and Nott, D. (1980). A closer look at university student teacher supervision, Journal of Teacher Education, 31(4), pp. 45-49.

Zimpher, N. and Howey K. (1987). Adapting supervisory practices to different orientations of teaching competence. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 2(2), pp. 101-27.